

Price 25 Cents.

THE
CONTROVERSY
BETWEEN
TRUE AND PRETENDED CHRISTIANITY.

AN ESSAY

DELIVERED BEFORE

THE MASSACHUSETTS METHODIST CONVENTION,

HELD IN BOSTON, OCT. 15, 1863.

BY

REV. L. T. TOWNSEND,

PROFESSOR OF HISTORICAL THEOLOGY IN THE BOSTON
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

Published by vote of the Convention.

LEE & SHEPARD, 149 WASHINGTON STREET,

BOSTON:

JAMES P. MAGEE, No. 5 CORNHILL.

1869.

~~Published by Lee & Shepard.~~

GOOD BOOKS FOR FAMILY READING.

SYDNIE ADRIANCE;

Or, Trying the World. By Miss Douglas, author of "In Trust ;
or, Dr. Bertrand's Household," "Stephen Dane," "Claudia," &c.
12mo, cloth. \$1.50.

"The works of Miss Douglas have stood the test of popular judgment, and borne the palm. They are true to nature in their delineations, pure and elevating in their tone, and we are safe in recommending them to all who wish reading alike pleasing and profitable."

DR. HOWELL'S FAMILY.

By Mrs. H. B. Goodwin, author of "Madge," "Sherbrooke," &c.
12mo, cloth. \$1.50.

The earlier works of this gifted writer have attracted attention, and been extensively read. The present "Dr. Howell's Family," is reprinted from the *Watchman* of Boston, where it was received with great favor.

HILLSBORO' FARMS.

By Miss Sophia Dickinson Cobb. 12mo, cloth. \$1.

"Hillsboro' Farms" is an original story of American life, and has already received warm commendations from distinguished literary gentlemen, to whom the story in manuscript was submitted. The publishers commend it to the public as a work pure in thought, rich in instruction, and highly interesting in incident and narrative.

ROSAMOND DAYTON.

By Mrs. H. C. Gardner, author of "Rosedale: A Story of Self-Denial," &c. 12mo, cloth. \$1.50.

Mrs. Gardner is well known by her former work, "Rosedale," printed and published by the Western Branch of the Methodist Book Concern, and which has had a large sale.

Competent judges, who have read both books, while awarding high praise to "Rosedale," pronounce "Rosamond Dayton" far superior in merit and interest.

Sold by all Booksellers and Newsdealers, and sent by mail, post paid, on receipt of price.

LEE & SHEPARD, Publishers, Boston.

on, April 3d, 1869.

with a copy of "The Controversy between Real and Pretended Christianity," by Rev. L. T. Townsend, for review in your paper. The following notice, prepared by one of the editors of a religious review in our city, may be of service to you in preparing a notice, should your time not admit of a careful perusal of the book:—

"'THE CONTROVERSY BETWEEN TRUE AND PRETENDED CHRISTIANITY' is a tersely written essay, originally read before a Massachusetts Methodist convention, by Rev. L. T. TOWNSEND, Professor of Historical Theology in the Boston Theological Seminary. The aim of the author is to show the difference between a practical as well as theoretical belief in the cardinal doctrines of the Evangelical Christian Church, and the formal acceptance of the observances of true Christianity, with or without an apparent acceptance of such doctrines, but with an actual rejection of them. He considers that the present controversy in the religious world rests upon this general statement; and he then discusses, (1) What are the parties engaged? (2) What are the vital points at issue? (3) Whether evangelical denominations are specially called upon to define their positions and defend their doctrines? (4) And with what spirit the controversy should be conducted?

TOWNSEND'S essay has already attracted wide attention for the forcible and compact manner in which he has treated the subject; for his vigorous presentation of both sides of the questions at issue; for his fairness;—and also for his boldness. As a keen investigation of the claims of modern Unitarianism it has few equals; and at the present time, when the best thought of the country is directed toward this and kindred subjects, the circulation and perusal of this book will prove a healthy stimulus and a powerful corrector of erroneous beliefs. Its price places it within reach of all. The author takes the Rev. James Freeman Clarke to be the truest representative of the class of religious thinkers whose views he examines and criticises, and regards him as their 'superior denominational diplomatist.' But he does this without any breach of courtesy, and has in this way secured a direct attention to his argument, as he doubtless intended to do. The more discussion on these points the better, and the sooner will come the daylight of a true and consistent Christianity."

THE CONTROVERSY BETWEEN REAL AND PRETENDED CHRISTIANITY will be sent by mail, post-paid, by LEE & SHEPARD, Publishers, Boston, on receipt of 50 cents for cloth, or 25 cents for paper covers.

THE
CONTROVERSY
BETWEEN
TRUE AND PRETENDED CHRISTIANITY.

A N E S S A Y

DELIVERED BEFORE
THE MASSACHUSETTS METHODIST CONVENTION,
HELD IN BOSTON, OCT. 15, 1863.

BY
REV. L. T. TOWNSEND,
PROFESSOR OF HISTORICAL THEOLOGY IN THE BOSTON
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

Published by vote of the Convention,

BOSTON:
LEE AND SHEPARD, 149 WASHINGTON ST.
JAMES P. MAGEE, 5 CORNHILL.

1869.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1868, by

LEE AND SHEPARD,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Columbia.

STEREOTYPED AT THE
BOSTON STEREOTYPE FOUNDRY,
NO. 19 SPRING LANE.

THE
CONTROVERSY
BETWEEN
TRUE AND PRETENDED CHRISTIANITY.

By True Christianity we mean a practical, as well as a theoretical, belief in the cardinal doctrines of the Evangelical Christian Church, such as, the special inspiration of the Scriptures; the special divinity of Christ; and that special divine life which is produced by the direct agency of the Holy Ghost in all hearts open to receive it, and which secures to its possessor future and endless happiness, and which entails upon its rejecter future and endless misery.

By Pretended Christianity is meant, a formal acceptance of the observances of evangelical Christianity, with or without an *apparent* acceptance of its cardinal doc-

trines, but in either case with an *actual* rejection of the same. The controversy between the two consists in the efforts put forth by the representative parties of each to establish in public favor their different, and necessarily conflicting opinions.

Four questions present themselves.

I. *Who and what are the parties engaged in the controversy?*

II. *What are the vital points at issue?*

III. *Are all evangelical denominations called upon, especially at the present time, publicly to define their positions and defend their established doctrines?*

IV. *With what spirit, on our part, ought this controversy to be conducted?*

I.

Who and what are the Parties engaged in the Controversy.

The various evangelical denominations, though differing in church polity and on minor points of doctrine, will, upon examination, be found a unit in regard to what

are termed the cardinal doctrines of the Christian system. These denominations constitute the Orthodox party. Differences between them grow out of the development, application, and formal statement of the doctrines referred to, but not out of the doctrines themselves. During the controversy, therefore, the Orthodox Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Baptists (Calvinistic and Free-will), and Methodists meet on a common platform. All these collectively, with perhaps individual additions from other sects, will be found rallying at a common point, as if to defend a common homestead. On the other hand, the representatives of False Christianity are the conservative and radical wings of the Unitarian and Universalist societies, reënforced by organized bodies of Medium Spiritualists, together with certain Materialistic, Naturalistic, and Pantheistic philosophers. So far as rationalism enters into any of these sects, it is that form of it which is opposed to Orthodox Supernaturalism, and which excludes all special and infallible revelations. So far as naturalism is involved, it is a naturalism which denies

either the possibility or the necessity of all kinds of supernatural revelations and manifestations, — a naturalism which may be Pantheistic or Deistic, — Spinozism or Bodinism.

Without pausing to draw the nicer shades of distinction which exist between naturalism and materialism, it will be sufficiently definite for our present purpose to distribute all naturalists among spiritualists on the one hand, and materialists on the other, according as their individual and prevailing tendencies incline. If this be allowed, we shall be able to avoid the discussion of distinctions which are not really essential to this essay, and can at once divide all the above-mentioned anti-evangelical sects into two general classes — *materialists* and *spiritualists*.

Materialists, in general, claim that all existences are developments from the various modifications of matter. They consequently oppose all forms of philosophic spiritualism, which teaches that above the universe is a Spirit, who sustains and directs. According to the philosophy of Materialists, there is no essential difference between John Mil-

ton and the bass-viol on which he discoursed music, — between Sir Isaac Newton and the vegetables of his garden. The difference is one of development, not of essence. The characteristic views advocated by Materialists, which best illustrate their divergence from Orthodoxy, are the following: —

They assert that the Scriptures are merely an evolution of nature, a product of fixed law, like the growth and maturity of a tree, or a thistle. They maintain, also, that Christ is a simple unfolding of nature, differing in no respect from the birth and growth of ordinary men and beasts. They affirm that the orthodox view of conversion and regeneration is absurd. The exact position they occupy respecting these doctrines is, that every man, at birth, receives certain positive and certain negative qualities, — so much mathematical plus, and so much mathematical minus; and that he cannot change in himself or in others, with divine help or without it, this + or —, any more than he can change a ledge of conglomerate rock into a mass of pure gold. They assume that there is no destiny for man except a nameless oblivion, in whose

comprehensive tomb existence of every kind is at length swallowed up, and in whose lasting embrace all individuality is completely lost. The best representatives of this class are the physicists of England, and such men as Vogt, Molescholt, and Büchner, of Germany.

One would naturally expect the assignment of Thomas Carlyle and R. W. Emerson to some position in this classification. Let not our silence in this respect be misinterpreted.

These men are of that high order of genius which precludes their assignment to the places which we assign ordinary men. They have sides that touch many points. They allow of no latitude or longitude. Genius and geography are antithetical terms. Such minds circumnavigate subjects. We see them to-day in the eastern horizon, but to-morrow in the western. They are sometimes theistic, sometimes atheistic, — they are materialistic, naturalistic, and spiritualistic. It is no evidence of superior mental sagacity for us to find apparent contradictions in these anomalistic intellects. Most attempts at opposing and dissecting them,

especially if frequent and extended quotations are employed, have resulted in the absorption of the dissector into the phantom genius of the subject, upon which every eye of those witnessing the operation is gradually fixed, the operator, meanwhile, vainly attempting to indicate his presence by feeble and unnoticed intonations. We have concluded, therefore, after merely stating that these men are heterodox, to let them alone.

Under the term Spiritualists, are included those societies which are anti-evangelical and anti-materialistic. Advocates of medium spiritualism are not necessarily embraced in this term, for *spiritualists*, in distinction from *materialists*, may bitterly oppose medium spiritualism; whilst medium spiritualists, singular as it may appear, are in some instances the grossest materialists. This class of anti-materialistic spiritualists we hereafter denominate the "*Mediatorial School*."

This descriptive word really belongs to Orthodoxy. It is a hallowed term. It connotes vastly more than it denotes. Only with mental reservations should it be allowed to pass from evangelical nomencla-

ture. But usage in language, like possession in law, becomes law. This designation has been employed in Germany as well as in America. In Germany, it denotes the effort to reconcile the pantheism of Schelling with the idealism of Fichte. Consequently the school of Schleiermacher is termed the "mediation" or "mediatorial" school. Rev. James Freeman Clarke indirectly assigns as a reason for employing this appellation in connection with his school, the fact that it occupies a position which mediates between Orthodoxy on the one hand, and extreme Naturalism on the other. Rev. O. B. Frothingham suggests his view, in a presentation of the ideal "prophet," whose office, he says, is "to effect a union of things discordant." Rev. Mr. Weiss, in his effort to reconcile the "real and ideal," — the "finite and the infinite," — allows his name to be enrolled under this same term. Here also belong W. R. Alger, D. A. Wasson, and others. We therefore surrender, for the present, the word "mediatorial," to be employed as above indicated, and, with some qualifications, we embrace under it all the leading rationalists of New

England, including such names as James Freeman Clarke, John Weiss, Samuel Johnson, D. A. Wasson, and O. B. Frothingham. In justice to these men, however, we ought to say, that upon many points they are widely at variance; but in justification of our assignment we ought also to say that they fall not into the category with Carlyle and Emerson, — not claiming to be geniuses, and not occupying the position of independent philosophers, but that of leaders and founders of societies; and also that the fundamental principles upon which they build their, variously shaded systems are substantially the same, excepting perhaps Mr. Clarke's *supposed* orthodox supernaturalism.

Bringing together all these various conservative, liberal, and infidel sects, notwithstanding there may be found gulfs between them, broad and deep; notwithstanding the hostility between materialists and spiritualists is nearly or quite as violent, though we hope not as discourteous as, that which existed between different evangelical denominations in the days of ungentlemanly and unchristian controversy; and notwithstand-

ing certain of these sects resent being classed in a connection, even the most remote, with certain opposite sects, — still, as a matter of fact, all these parties stand as a unit in their antagonism to true Christianity. That is, they concurrently oppose its fundamentals in full or in part. They reject a special and infallible revelation; they oppose the doctrine of a special and divine Saviour, who is coequal with God; and they discard from their creeds a special and supernatural life, the work of the Holy Ghost, upon which are conditioned future and endless rewards and punishments.

We have, in the foregoing enumeration of our opponents, it will be noticed, specified no particular party, which, on account of the position it occupies, deserves especial notice. The character of the essay is such as to require that this designation now be made. The principle involved in the specification is a natural one. A skilful general, in conducting an engagement with an enemy, whose ranks are inharmonious, will not attempt to draw upon his own troops a concentrated fire, unless he is prepared for or desires it. He will stand simply on the defensive re-

specting one and another of his enemy's divisions, and will attack for the time only those who are nearest his own line of operations, or who are actually advancing into his own territories. It is precisely this skilful military policy which should decide the Orthodox party in its selection of the particular sect with which it is both duty and policy to join immediate issue; meanwhile defensive elsewhere. The exigencies requiring this movement seem so urgent, that it should be made at once, though it may result in a combined attack upon Orthodoxy. Never has it been better prepared to receive such an assault.

This convention need scarcely be informed, that the party which is nearest our own line, — which has already commenced aggressive movements against us, and which therefore claims our almost undivided attention, — is the "Mediatorial School."

We have nothing at present to apprehend, either from medium or pantheistic Spiritualism, from atheistic Materialism, or from pure philosophical Naturalism. These false philosophies and sects will perish, and are perishing of themselves. They have salt

neither in fact nor in appearance. The same general observation applies to the conservatism of both Unitarians and Universalists. They possess scarcely vitality sufficient to preserve them in existence another half century.

It is the "Mediatorial School" which is soon to occupy the field against us: from this wing of the opposition we are soon to receive the most violent attack ever made upon Orthodoxy; and to this wing, from our own churches, will flock such as are unhappy and disaffected.

We trust we shall be pardoned for being somewhat personal while drawing the controversial lines still closer. A sentiment expressed in form of an interrogation by the editor of the Radical, in an article on "Radicals and Unitarians," we construe into a justification of the course we propose.

"Has not the time arrived," he asks, "when the cause demands of us all that we come out from the midst of our opponents, and take before the world a fair and unequivocal position; that we speak plain words, and call things by their right names?" We reply, most certainly. It is useless to con-

fine ourselves to generalities in this age of specialities. We follow, therefore, the suggestion of the Radical, when we say that the controversy between true and false Christianity, — between truth and error, between Christianity and Infidelity, as we are pleased to employ the terms (they mean the same thing), — reduces itself to a controversy between Orthodoxy and the "Mediatorial School," as represented by James Freeman Clarke, of this city.

The self-acknowledged anti-supernatural, or extreme wing of the Mediatorials, will be busily occupied for the present in *mediating* between the "finite and infinite," and in explaining where, according to their naturalistic theories, the divine ends, and the human begins, in all natural and in all historic phenomena. The settlement of this difficulty will eventuate in Orthodoxy or Atheism. Mr. Clarke's particular branch of this school escapes, for the present, from this dilemma, simply by a dexterous use of language.

We would not, however, be misunderstood in giving Mr. Clarke this prominent position. We speak in no disrespect of other mediatorials. The school numbers finer

rhetoricians than he, — more vigorous writers and deeper thinkers. But Mr. Clarke is the superior denominational diplomatist. He exerts the greater moulding influence over the young men of the Radical school. He circulates the more freely among evangelical denominations. He is more successful than others in preparing hospitals for wounded theologians, and cemeteries for such as are dead and dying. He seems also to have made a discovery, which others of this school have not, that the ingenuous and intelligent masses of society stand aghast at the poverty of undecorated naturalistic spiritualism. He very prudently seeks to occupy a position in which he expects to be able to convert this distrust into faith and confidence. His *mediation*, in distinction from that of the rest of the school, has special reference to Orthodoxy. In fine, the position he occupies among Unitarians, having obtained from them all the concessions he desired in the late National Unitarian Convention held in New York, and the position he now occupies respecting Orthodoxy, having accepted largely its phraseology, put him far in advance of all his school-fellows.

Other positions of the Mediatorials must sooner or later be yielded, — his, or one even in advance of his, must be occupied, or the controversy ends, and Orthodoxy, on account of its hold upon the religious nature of the race, — on account of its perfect adaptation to the hunger and thirst of men, and on account of having its foundations laid in the eternal principles of universal truth, will be at once and forever triumphant. The foregoing, then, are our reasons for selecting the school of Mr. Clarke as the object of our special attention.

From this designation of classes we now pass to the second inquiry proposed.

II.

What are the vital Points at Issue in the Controversy between True and Pretended Christianity.

The religious and philosophical controversialist should seek, like the forest hunter, for living and thriving game. His ammunition is too expensive, his time too valuable, and his services in too high and pressing de-

mand to be expended upon straw instead of men, — upon grave-yards, instead of fields of action, — upon dead, instead of living issues. To beleaguer an enemy's hospital is at once cowardly, and thoroughly unsoldierlike. Christ knew that the dead would bury the dead, or he would have enjoined that service upon the living.

With some noble exceptions, is it not true that orthodox Polemics, since the Reformation, have not ventured to attack their antagonists until they were expiring from wounds received from other quarters? Is it not high time that we had so cultivated our power of discernment, and so familiarized ourselves with field movements, as always to be in readiness to turn our artillery from deserted fortifications upon those which are well-manned?

Are not new evolutions demanded when an enemy changes front, or attempts flank movements? Shall we waste time in framing arguments to support *future* retribution, since it is contended for by Unitarians, Universalists, Theodore Parker, and Ralph Waldo Emerson, with a zeal surpassing ours?

Is it advisable for us to discourse against French atheism, or English deism, since these infidelities are left, long ago, far in the rear of the field at present occupied? Is it not still less advisable for us to charge these errors directly or inferentially upon those who, instead of advocating, oppose them?

The "Mediatorial School" will listen to all we are able to present in opposition to Materialism or Pantheism, and, we may add, in opposition to the lifeless doctrines of conservative Unitarians and Universalists; and when we have concluded, will file handsome indorsements to all we have said, and add sentiments which, for strength and finish, will equal anything we can pronounce.

This is true of the left wing, even of this school. The Rev. Mr. Weiss is one of its ablest and most logically consistent representatives. There is no man in New England who is more flat-footed in his opposition to the entire Orthodox party; — still there is no man in New England who is more strenuous than he in his opposition to the whole school of Conservatives and Materialists. His rhetoric is sweeping, his logic clinching, when in contact with those who hold to the

letter, but who reject the spirit, of reforms ; and with those who advocate a philosophy, which finds not a personal God everywhere, and personal responsibility for every man.*

Mr. Clarke also vigorously opposes all materialistic and pantheistic notions. He argues against the school of Darwin with the earnestness of an orthodox believer. In certain respects he seems to pass quite beyond Orthodoxy on the question of Materialism, and even chides us for discovering so little of the supernatural where so much is revealed. Mr. Clarke says, —

“God has been all around us ; † never far from us ; but theology has only been willing to see him in Jewish history, in sacred books, or on Sundays in churches. Let us see him there all we can, but see him also in every rippling brook, in every tender flower, in all beauty, all sub-

* While regarding the views of Mr. Weiss as the embodiment of false Christianity, both in essence and expression, still we take pleasure in saying, that for several years we have enjoyed the most cordial social relations with him ; and no differences of religious opinions — though the most extreme — have been allowed for a moment to interfere with personal regard.

† Unless otherwise stated, our quotations are from Dr. Clarke’s “Orthodoxy, its Truths and Errors.”

limity, all arrangement and adaptation of this world."

He further says, —

"Christianity itself has been an uninterrupted series of supernatural events. Bad men are made good, weak men strong, cowardly men brave, ignorant and foolish men wise, by a supernatural influence given in answer to prayer, poured down into hearts and minds which open themselves to receive it. This seems to me to be the truth of orthodox supernaturalism separated from its errors."

Unless we observe the distinctions required to be made, by the employment of such language as the above, though they be differences of words rather than of things, instead of indiscriminately and unqualifiedly classing Mediatorials among those with whom they have nothing *positive* in common, we shall fail entirely in answering to the public satisfaction the vital questions now pending between a True and False Christianity.

It appears then, upon careful review, that, as the controversy is between parties who, from their professions, *seem* to believe the same thing, i. e., the practical and theoretical doctrines of Christianity, the points at issue grow out of the presentation of these

doctrines by the opposing parties representing them, — on the one hand through rationalistic, and on the other through orthodox supernaturalism. We may add that every doctrine of the code is involved.

In illustrating these statements, and in presenting the points at issue, we are prepared to admit to the adherents of Mr. Clarke all they may desire respecting his supposed evangelical inclinations and professions.

It is claimed, for instance, that Mr. Clarke is nearly, or quite, orthodox, upon the subject of

MIRACLES.

Mr. Clarke, and others of his school, it is true, find language among orthodox believers which they freely employ in the expression of their views. The texts of the New Testament they press with wonderful closeness of application towards the evangelical line. Mr. Clarke admits that Jesus may have instantly healed sick people, and have brought the dead to life, by the power that emanated from his "masterly and commanding spirit."

In replying to the Westminster Review, in reference to its indorsement of Strauss's anti-supernatural "Life of Christ," Mr. Clarke very pertinently inquires, —

"But why should it be an unnatural thing, that one so full of a supernatural life as Jesus, should be raised to a position where, by his very word or touch, he could cure disease, and that even at a distance? We are irresistibly inclined to say that these stories [of miracles] must be simple facts. Delusion never spake in this tone, — so clear, so luminous, in language so honest and sincere."

It is well for us to note particularly the quotation following, for the first few sentences apply admirably to a large class of literature which is at present corrupting the public thought of the country.

"This (Naturalism) is what claims to be science. We deny that it is science, and assert it to be pure dogmatism and theory. It is pure theory to assume the resurrection of Jesus to be a violation of law. The scientific course is neither to deny the facts, nor to explain them away, but to study them. The resurrection of Jesus deserves such a study. The resurrection may have been an example of a universal law. The same superior command of miraculous force which appeared during his life, enabled him, *perhaps*, to show himself easily and freely wherever he would. . . . The resurrection of Jesus, so regarded, becomes the most *natural* thing in the world.'

This same view is also advocated by a follower of Mr. Clarke, in the *Radical*, in an article on "The Radical Dogmatics." *

"But although the man of true science," says the article, "like Comte, disallows miracles, it is none the less puerile in M. Renan, M. Taine, and our own still more egregious scientific foundlings, to begin dogmatizing thereupon, and declare miracle impossible in the very nature of things. It is not very obvious to me that these perfunctory gentlemen have ever seriously set themselves to inquire what this 'very nature of things' is. . . . To dogmatize upon miracle, or affirm that it is philosophically impossible, is either grossly to beg the question, or else to overlook that necessary growth of the mind which historically legitimates it."

Pass to the subject of

INSPIRATION.

It is claimed that Mr. Clarke is so thoroughly orthodox on the subject of the Inspiration of the Bible, that no point of issue can be raised. We admit it so appears.

In defending Christian or Supernatural inspiration, Mr. Clarke says, —

"It is the work of the Holy Spirit on the heart. It is that influence which came to the apostles,

* October, 1866.

and to all Christians, after Jesus left the earth, to unite them inwardly with Christ. . . . The writers of the New Testament have been where we have not been. They have ascended heights and sounded depths in the spiritual world unknown to us. Orthodoxy is right in maintaining the supreme excellence and value of the Christian Scriptures. . . . It is right in saying they are written by inspired men. . . . It is right in calling the Bible the Holy Scriptures."

And then, as if unable of himself to do the subject ample justice, he quotes the following admirable sentiment, which fell from the lips of Theodore Parker, to whom Mr. Clarke adheres, declaring him to be "*sound*" upon all points excepting his views regarding sin : —

" This collection of books * has taken such a hold on the world as no other. It is read of a Sabbath in all the ten thousand pulpits of our land. The sun never sets on its gleaming page. It goes equally to the cottage of the plain man, and the palace of the king. It is woven into the literature of the scholar, and colors the talk of the street. The bark of the merchant cannot sail the sea without it; no ships of war go to the conflict, but the Bible is there. It enters men's closets; mingles in all the grief and cheerfulness of life. The affianced maiden prays God in Scripture for strength in her new duties; men

* " Discourse of Religion."

are married by Scripture. The Bible attends them in their sickness, when the fever of the world is on them. The aching head finds a softer pillow when the Bible lies underneath. The mariner, escaping from shipwreck, clutches this first of his treasures, and keeps it sacred to God. It goes with the pedler in his crowded pack; cheers him at eventide, when he sits down dusty and fatigued; brightens the freshness of his morning face. It blesses us when we are born; gives names to half Christendom; rejoices with us; has sympathy for our mourning; tempers our grief to finer issues. It is the better part of our sermons. It lifts man above himself; our best of uttered prayers are in its storied speech, wherewith our fathers and the patriarchs prayed. The timid man, about awaking from this dream of life, looks through the glass of Scripture, and his eye grows bright; he does not fear to stand alone, to tread the way unknown and distant, to take the death-angel by the hand, and bid farewell to wife, and babes, and home. Men rest on this their dearest hopes. It tells them of God, and of his blessed Son; of earthly duties, and of heavenly rest."

This sentiment, like many things which have been said by various Mediatorials, respecting all our doctrines, will live, because there is in it the true ring of the grand old evangelical love and veneration for the Bible. A Christian mother might well be proud of a son, who could say so much, and say it so

well. In his better moments Mr. Parker was wont to open his heart, and for the time to admit into it evangelical truth, as rocks sometimes part, and receive into their seams and crevices native silver and pure gold. Men blast away the rocks, and then are found the precious metals ages afterwards; not homogeneous with the rocks, though embosomed in them.

We advance from the subject of Inspiration to the doctrines of

CONVERSION AND REGENERATION.

It is claimed that Mr. Clarke is comparatively orthodox upon these subjects, and that no issue can be fairly made out respecting them. We admit, in this instance also, that it so appears.

“If Christianity is a life,” says Mr. Clarke, “it must begin with a birth; if a journey, it cannot be taken except we set out; if an education, we must determine to commence the education; if labor in God’s vineyard, we must go into the vineyard and begin. There are only two classes — those who are alive, and those who are not alive; those who are taking the journey, and those who have not yet set out; those who are studying, and those who have not yet begun to

study ; those who are at work for God, and those who are standing idle. The distinction into two classes seems, therefore, substantial and real. It does not follow, to be sure, that these two classes can be distinguished so easily by the eye of man, but they certainly can be by the eye of God."

Speaking of the nature and reality of the change of heart, he says, —

"Not only the whole direction of the life is changed, but the motive power is different, and the spirit different. Instead of ambition, there is content ; in the place of sensitive vanity, there comes humility ; instead of anxiety, trust in God. The burden of sin is taken away ; the sense of our unworthiness no longer torments us, for God has forgiven our sins. Duty no longer seems arduous and difficult, for there is joy in doing anything for the sake of God. This life of faith makes all things new. Old things have passed away, and the outward world is fresh as on the first morning of creation. Our inward and outward life are both new. We have new convictions, new affections, new aims, new hopes, new joys. Nature is new, life is new, the Bible is new, the future world is new. Such and so great is the change which Orthodoxy assumes as the result of conversion. And the experience of the whole Church, the biography of the saints in every denomination, *assure us of the substantial truth of this description.*"

The difference between Conversion and Regeneration is thus stated : —

“Conversion is an act, regeneration an experience. It is a duty to repent, but to become regenerate is a gift to be received afterwards. God commands conversion; he bestows regeneration. Submission is an act of our own; faith is the gift of God. A change of outward life and conduct we accomplish ourselves, — at least we endeavor to accomplish it [how admirably put!]; the change of heart God himself will bestow.”

Can we not safely say that Mr. Clarke, in the above sentiment, has given a faultless expression of sound theology upon the doctrines of Conversion and Regeneration?

But proceed to the subject of

CHRIST AND HIS ATONEMENT.

“Christ,” he says, “was something more than mere man, — something more than Moses and Elijah, — something more than a man of great religious genius. The peculiarity of Christ was, that he was chosen by God’s wisdom, and prepared by God’s providence, to be the typical man of the race, — the God-man in whom the divine Spirit and human soul become one in a perfect union. He was, perhaps, placed, by an exceptional birth, where the first Adam stood, rescued from inherited depravity, made in the image of God. Then the Spirit was given him without measure. The word of God dwelt in him, and did not merely come to him as a transient influence for a special purpose. The Spirit in Christ was one with God.” . . .

“Is it any wonder, then, that men should have called Jesus God? that they should call him so still? In him truly ‘dwelt the fulness of the Godhead bodily;’ and this indwelling Spirit expressed itself in what he said, and what he did. When Jesus speaks, it is as if God speaks. When Jesus does anything, it is as if we saw God do it. It becomes to us an expression of the Divine character. When Jesus says to the sinner, ‘Go, and sin no more,’ we see in this a manifestation not merely of his own compassion, but of God’s forgiving love. . . . He is the image of the invisible God — the first-born of the whole creation.”

“The death of Christ, therefore, is not merely an *emblem* of God’s love, but an *act* of God’s love. It draws us to him. It changes our hearts. It melts our doubt, our distrust. It reveals to us our Father’s love. The blood of Christ makes those who were afar off, nigh. This all experience teaches as a matter of fact. It is the cross of Christ, borne by the simple missionary, preached by the devout Moravian, which, amid the ice of Greenland, or beneath the burning sun of the tropic, reconciles the sinner to God.” . . .

“We can believe,” continues Mr. Clarke, “that God in Christ does reconcile the world to himself, — does create a sense of pardoned sin, — does remove the weight of transgression, — does take away the obstacle in our conscience, — does help us into a living faith, hope, peace, and joy. . . . What we need is faith in God’s pardoning, redeeming, saving love in Christ Jesus [Amen!]; faith that our sins are blotted out; that we can come at once to our Father; that we can come boldly to the throne of grace; that the

infinite Father looks at us with love when we are a great way off and says, 'This my son was dead, and is alive again; was lost, and is found.' " . . .

A word respecting the connated doctrine of

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

Speaking of Luther and his work, Mr. Clarke says, —

"It was the soul of his preaching, the essence of his doctrine, the secret of his strength, the life of his life. And so, when Wesley and the early Methodists were called upon to pour new religious life into the English Church, they fell back on this doctrine — this ancient sword of the Spirit. And so we may believe that it has a value for all ages; that it did not relate merely to Jewish usages, but is a principle of vital and everlasting application." . . .

If there were not danger of overloading this essay with quotations, we should cite from Mr. Clarke concerning the doctrines of the Trinity, Immortality, Resurrection of the Body, the Second Coming of Christ, and Eternal Retribution, to show that there is a real appearance of Orthodoxy in what he says respecting them; but enough has been quoted to prove that the *language* employed by the Doctor, and the school he

represents, is often entirely unexceptionable. These men frequently roll the great doctrines of Orthodoxy, as a delightful morsel under their tongues. We seem to discern in the Christian system, under their handling, a species of lusciousness, which we too frequently fail to discover when it is presented at the hands of certain noted Orthodox doctors of divinity. The members of this Mediatorial Fraternity are to the Methodist church peculiarly friendly. Nor do we wish it otherwise. They feel that we are right upon all questions of moral reform; upon most of which they themselves are. They see that we have been doing a vast work in evangelizing the world. They generously applaud our efforts, and we sincerely wish we could, in this last regard, return the compliment. They come to us, not as dissenters, not as opponents, but as friendly explorers. They find many things in our creed which they adopt into their own. Mr. Clarke speaks of the Methodist church as the "*great and noble body*" which has done a "*vast work for Christianity*."

As Methodism stands before this Mediatorial system, listening to its concessions

and professions, its hearty salutations and congratulations, its acknowledgments to John Wesley's theology and to Charles Wesley's hymnology, is it surprising that there should have been some perplexity as to the course it should pursue, wishing not to be outdone in the matter of simple politeness and general good-breeding? The case is stronger than this even. Some of our church, not having learned the tactical evolutions of these men, have been wont to imagine that every sentence from their lips reeked with avowed infidelity, and that every word was pointed with a bitter blasphemy, — as with Parker, in the unhappy moments of his repudiation of Orthodoxy. When, therefore, we meet these model gentlemen, and hear from their lips our own favorite theories so handsomely clothed, and listen to encomiums so richly bestowed upon the fathers of our church, whose names we venerate; and when we learn, to our surprise and mortification, that the Mediatorials, from their pulpits, have often been preaching, in *form*, precisely the same things as those declared by ourselves from our pulpits, is it surprising if, partly through the feeling of injustice done in

our false judgments, and partly through a natural and generous impulse characteristic of our church, we have been tardy in designating positions, and in not shrinking from the thought of denominational recognition and future amnesty from all hostilities? But gradually our eyes have been opened. We were not so mistaken in our first as in our second judgment. A very brief system of logic will disclose to us the exact position of things, — a discovery which is by no means unimportant. By it we may learn whether or not the battle between truth and error has really been fought, and may settle the question whether we should rest on our arms, or polish them for the impending engagement. The Mediatorial school, as represented by Mr. Clarke, is either orthodox or infidel in its tendencies and aims. If orthodox, it means what we do by its expressions, and will be comparatively uniform in its statements. If infidel, it possesses the most dangerous form of infidelity ever presented to any people. Notice: in phraseology this school approaches nearer to Orthodoxy than the most evangelical wings of Unitarianism and Universalism. Dr. Peabody and Dr.

Miner will by no means make as many verbal concessions as does James Freeman Clarke. Must we not conclude, then, that the doctrine of this school is either a most genuine coin or a most spurious one? Is it not this close resemblance to the genuine that renders the counterfeit all the more dangerous? Is there any such thing as deliberate and intentional efforts put forth, at the same time, both in the interests of Orthodoxy and Infidelity? Can a man serve faithfully two masters? Must not this Mediatorial *thing* be either an angel of light, or something else glistening in the white and spotless robes of an angel? Is it not the livery of heaven in the service of revealed truth, or in the service of its adversary? Is it not either pure Evangelism, or rank Infidelity under the garb of Orthodoxy? Which is it? Does not the following inquiry contain half the answer? That is, would not Mr. Clarke smile at our genuine simplicity should we presume to say that he is evangelical? The simplicity and harmlessness of the dove is well, if there be added thereto the wisdom and skill of the serpent. Did Mr. Clarke live in an age and country

where the prevailing tone of all talk was in mockery and contempt of Christianity, we might be more inclined to look upon his course as only an effort to commend what is fundamental in Christianity to the more enlightened thinkers of the day. But the times are such, and Mr. Clarke's position such, that we are forbidden to recommend such a charitable construction. We feel compelled to say, that his system is rather Rationalism paling before the advances of evangelical truth, and shrinking in sceptical misgivings, under a guise of seeming Orthodoxy, from positions hitherto occupied. It is a desperate effort to save Parkerism from death and burial.

But return to the test. Mr. Clarke's school, when pressed for explanations, does not and dares not pretend to mean what we do by its orthodox expressions, — nor are its statements uniform. Said a Unitarian gentleman to us not long since, "I do not know what to make of Mr. Clarke; he is orthodox one day and radical the next." The same criticism is passed not unfrequently upon other members of this school. But those who make them have but partially compre-

hended the position occupied. The clew has not been discovered; and without this discovery no school or man can be interpreted. We do not believe Mr. Clarke ever fired a random shot in his life. He carries no blank cartridges. His aim is always deliberate. His apparently stray shots are discharged to pick off some careless skirmisher, or to bring in some hesitating deserter. We cannot read Mr. Clarke's writings critically without experiencing the sensation that we are being borne on very steadily, from beginning to end, to a definite conclusion. True, if understood in one way, he runs in one direction; understood in another way, he runs in exactly the opposite direction. Let us, for relief, change the main figure of the essay for a moment. One feels, while reading Mr. Clarke, that the hand of an experienced pilot is at the helm. There are no sudden jerkings, but like a well-rigged bark navigating a difficult channel, the curves are all gracefully swept. The vessel now tips a little to this side, now a trifle to that; the ballast is now upon this quarter, directly it is shifted to that. Betimes the main sheet is taken in a little or the jib let out. The

rudder is brought slowly far to this side, the next moment the helm-wheel is flying in the opposite direction ; you hear the concealed rattling of the rudder-chain, and feel a breath of wind from a new quarter. But look ! a threatening rock has just been passed here to the right, a dangerous bar there to the left. It is the hand of no novice, but of a master at the wheel. The tacking of the ship is one thing, the purpose of the pilot quite another.

Return to our original figure. Mr. Clarke is a thoroughly skilled military leader. He has been through and through the Orthodox encampment. He knows its strength in numbers, influence, and position. He has watched the vast array of recruits yearly received. He has visited those halls found in all places of considerable size throughout Christendom, — halls which are consecrated by young men to the service of Christ. Employing the term in no repulsive sense, he is a master-spy — king of spies. He knows the land, its grape-clusters, fruit-trees, giant inhabitants, and walled towns, as thoroughly as did Joshua those of the Land of Promise ; and this is what troubles the

Doctor, — that he does not, and cannot, possess them.

We hope we shall not be misunderstood respecting our estimate of Mr. Clarke. We entertain, notwithstanding all we have said, and in full view of all we are about to say, a kindly charity towards the affable Divine. We believe he is too much of a gentleman to cherish personal ill-will towards any one. It is not the believer he would injure, but the belief of the believer. Mr. Clarke, undoubtedly, though very unwisely, imagines that his efforts are fraught with nothing but good to the orthodox church, though involving its overthrow. He would produce "an era of good feeling" among all denominations, — an era which, we are happy to say, is rapidly approaching, without his assistance, among all evangelical societies. It is, however, a sad mistake on his part to dream that any other thing will produce this condition, save the acceptance of Christ as the divine Saviour of the world, — not through a figure of speech, but through a vital contact with a living reality. Let Mr. Clarke take this step, and embrace the other doctrines based upon it, and he has done

more to bring about what he and all philanthropists desire, than can be realized from the combined operations of all the flattering illusions and bilingual advocacies ever dreamed of. This cloudy use of language may, for a time, confuse the unthinking, since it is a kind of "elaborate silence" respecting the main questions between us; but nothing is absolutely accomplished. Compromises of words put the sword beside the sheath, not into it. We look upon all these mediatorial efforts as merely a temporary postponement of an inevitable crisis. It is Buchanan's policy. It is a most difficult and profitless channel to navigate, — this between "aye" and "no," when either is better. Enough of both sides will neutralize both. We cannot ignore differences which are radical. Opposing principles do not allow a progressive mean to hold a middle course. Lukewarm water is not palatable. Neutrals are of small account. Salve is good, but salve and a scalpel are better. We are inclined to bestow upon Mr. Clarke the good-natured criticism which an English writer* passes upon the supernaturalism of Ewald. These

* Mackay.

unfailing resources of theological subtlety may remind us of the judicious principle of domestic management advocated by Caleb Balderstone; "A good excuse is better than the things themselves; for these maun be consumed with time, whereas a good come-off, carefully and discreetly used, may serve a gentleman and his family Heaven knows how long."

It is a very charitable construction to put upon Mr. Clarke's mediatorialism to say, that it resembles in character the "half-way rationalism" of Germany during the first of the last century; and it is reasonable to predict for it a similar fate. J. W. F. Jerusalem, J. J. Spaulding, and Zollikoffer, the eminent preacher of Leipsic, men distinguished in speculative theology, possessing a comprehensive grasp of Christian doctrine, of unquestioned sincerity, virtue, and piety, "directed their efforts to such a system of accommodation and concession as should disarm the opposition of avowed infidels, and yet not displease thorough-going believers.*" But what was the result? The learned Steffens has given it to us. "They

* Hagenbach.

opened a path," he says, "which eventually led to avowed rationalism: instead of conducting the minds of this age away from infidelity, they aided, in the end, the general sceptical movement of the age." Mr. Clarke is a student of history; if he has the least regard for evangelical Christianity, he should abandon his present position and views, for, instead of "conducting the minds of the age away from infidelity," he will aid, "in the end, the general sceptical movement of the age." And it may appear, upon examination, that he is already adding to the movement more directly than his orthodox friends are aware.

We have admitted that Mr. Clarke, at times, *appears* to be nearly orthodox in his statements of evangelical truths. A further examination will show that he is no less sceptical, and far more objectionable than the most radical of the radicals; for, while flattering Orthodoxy, he is continually distilling rationalistic Unitarianism.* We take up,

* The publishing house of the American Unitarian Association, in its notice of this work of Mr. Clarke from which we have so extensively quoted, employs the following language: "Unitarians who desire to make converts to their faith can in no way effect their purpose

again the order followed while making our concessions to the supposed correctness of Mr. Clarke.

MIRACLES.

The same pen, which has written so many pleasant words for Orthodoxy on this subject, has, upon the same page, published the following for Infidelity. After stating his position in such a form as to allow a dog to work miracles in presence of a tree, a man in presence of a dog, a girl in the asylum at Worcester, and Joan of Arc in presence of people less inspired, — to show, doubtless, that this is nothing exceptional in the world or in providence, — Mr. Clarke sums up the result of his experimenting thus : —

“ We may believe the miracles of Jesus to be *natural*, in this sense, that under the same conditions they could have been done by others, and that they are probably prophetic of a time in which they *shall* be done by others.”

The real meaning of the writer, unless the time to which he refers is the future life, — in which case his argument fails of touching

better than by circulating, among their Orthodox friends, this admirable book.”

the point he is seeking to establish — is this : if any of us live sufficiently long, we, like Joshua, shall bid, if we choose, the sun stand still upon Gibeon, and the moon over the valley of Aijalon. We shall walk the sea like our Saviour, cross to Europe as though our way were macadamized with granite, and glide over lesser bodies of water as though they were the floor of a dancing-hall. Standing at the gates of Mount Auburn, we shall, in that day, bid the broken-hearted-widow's son to life again, and return with her to her home rejoicing. It is only a question of time. How credulous, in our age, the scepticism of the sceptic ! How sceptical the credulity of the credulous !

We are of course compelled, at this point, to differ widely from Mr. Clarke. A miracle, as to its nature, is not a question of time, excepting the condition of an appropriate time. Absolute or relative time forms not the least ingredient part of a miracle. A miracle, according to Orthodoxy, is a supernatural effect, evident and wonderful to sense, produced directly or indirectly by the Creator, for the purpose of attesting, in an appropriate manner, a message or a fact.

It is not necessarily a violation of law, but is necessarily a violation of uniform experience. Miracles, in a theological sense, ceased in the apostolic age. Will Mr. Clarke, with no mental reservations, with no neutralizing "perhapses," accept this definition? If he does, he is soundly orthodox; if he does not, he is profoundly heterodox. It may be retorted that many orthodox writers have given a more limited definition than the above; are not they, therefore, "profoundly heterodox?" The thing is not whether they have given this definition, but whether they will accept it.

Pass to the subject of

INSPIRATION.

We have previously admitted that the doctor appears orthodox in some of his expressions on this important doctrine; but further examination shows that he is otherwise, and entirely at issue with Orthodoxy. Speaking of his school, he says, —

"They cannot believe every word of the Bible to be the Word of God, for they find things in it contradictory to the evidence of history and the intuitions of Reason, and also contradicting other evidence of the same book."

If Mr. Clarke here means that a few unessential errors may have slightly corrupted the text in certain places, not through the fault of the inspired writers, but through the carelessness of copyists and translators, then we agree with him. All intelligent men see, however, that this does not affect, in the least, the question of inspiration; — this is only a question of supernatural preservation, which is not claimed by Orthodoxy.* But on the other hand, if he means more than this, — if he means that the mistake is with the inspired prophet, Old or New Testament, — then we flatly deny the grounds of his objection, and demand other proof than what is merely assertive. He continues: —

“We shall be obliged to say that Moses was not inspired to teach geology or history; that what he taught on these subjects he taught from such sources as were available to him, and that he was liable to error.”

To this we take the liberty of replying, that the evidence to us is overwhelming that Moses was inspired to teach both geology and history, and was not liable to error. In the absence of Moses, we, in his behalf,

* Revelation xxii. 19.

plead "not guilty." We again demand proof, not assertion.

"All Scripture," continues Mr. Clarke, "is inspired; not merely Jewish or Christian Scripture, but all sacred writing. All books which the human race has accepted are inspired, — the Vedas, Koran, Zandavesta, are sacred Scriptures."

"All men have their hours or moments of inspiration. . . . The poet, the artist, have their inspirations. But the scholar, the thinker, has his also. The man who invents a machine often has the idea come to him by an inspiration. The man who discovers a continent has seen it in idea before he sees it in reality. If Shakspeare was an inspired man, so was Newton, so was Columbus, so was Lord Bacon, so was Faust when he discovered printing, Watt when he improved the steam engine, and Daguerre when he found out photographic pictures; for in all great discoveries and inventions, and in small ones too, the original idea is an inspiration, though it has to be worked out mechanically by hard thinking." . . .

The meaning is this: The inventors of the penny trumpet, paper kite, and popgun were aided by precisely the same kind of divine inspiration as that which spake through the prophets of Israel. The difference is one of degree only. Isaiah, after receiving an "original idea," worked out his sublime prophecies "mechanically, by hard thinking."

The point at issue is clearly apparent. The orthodox party and mediatorial school both believe that the Bible is inspired — every verse and every word inspired. We say it is inspired as no other book has been ; they say exactly like all other books of its kind.

We say it is exclusive authority. They say it is of no more absolute authority than the dramas of Shakspeare, or the novels of Sir Walter Scott, as far as they go. We say, it is for the race the ultimate standard of right. They say it is not. We say it is a full and complete revelation of the Divine will, adapted to all ages and conditions of mankind. They say it is not ; and, if logical in their deduction, they will say that the Bible is a book that is destined to give place to other and more sacred scriptures in those ages when ordinary men work miracles.

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH, AND THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT THROUGH AN INFINITE AND DIVINE CHRIST.

The death of John Brown is regarded by this school as an atoning death, and the blood of Abraham Lincoln is regarded as

atoning blood. Justification is obtained by looking to these men in the same manner as in looking to Christ. After stating that the law of vicarious suffering is universal, Mr. Clarke proceeds to illustrate it in the death of Socrates, Joan of Arc, Savonarola, and Abraham Lincoln, and reaches the following somewhat remarkable conclusion : —

“ The death of Jesus, therefore, manifested in a higher degree the same law which is illustrated in the deaths of all good and great souls, martyrs to a principle or an idea. In proportion to the greatness and universality of the idea, and the greatness and holiness of the martyr, is the impression profound.”

“ Of them,” i. e., Socrates, Joan of Arc, &c., “ exactly as of Christ, we may say, that when they died the hour came for them to be glorified. They died, and they rose again. The resurrection, in these instances, came close after the crucifixion; not seen in their cases as in that of Jesus, by the visible eye, but essentially the same thing inwardly as his. They and their cause went *up*, instead of going *down*, by their death. When they were lifted up, they drew all men to them. In all such deaths, also, there is a certain atoning, reconciling influence.”

Here, then, is the point at issue. Mr. Clarke's mediatorial school claims that Christ, in the work of justification and atonement, does not differ *essentially* from other

men. We say he does thus differ. Mr. Clarke says what is true of Christ is true of others, except in degree. We say not so; but there is a difference in nature and result as well as in degree. Jesus, to him, is an uncommonly excellent Jewish gentleman, whose father was, *perhaps*, Joseph the carpenter, whose mother was Mary, Joseph's legal wife. This is only qualified with a "*perhaps*," — a perhaps so strangely employed, that at some future time it will allow some other birth to take place which is not unlike Christ's; if, indeed, his differed in the least from that of all others.

We are aware, while listening to the other side of this view as presented by the distinguished Doctor, one might come to an entirely different conclusion, — an illustration merely of the fact that the position occupied by him is double-sided. The following criticism* from Samuel Johnson, upon Mr. Clarke, is in point: —

“When a Trinitarian says, Jesus is the living God, I can apprehend, though I do not believe him; but when a Unitarian puts Jesus in place of Him, I meet hosts of incongruities at every

* Radical, October, 1866.

step, and the impracticability of the position is reflected in the irreconcilable uses both of arguments and terms. . . . The inconsistencies to which I have referred are not incidental. They are involved in the effort to hold a middle course between essentially opposite principles; to turn great questions between an official Christ and a human Jesus into mere sliding-scales of 'more and less.' "

Let us break away for a moment from this position, which is alike aggravating to friend and foe.

The father of Christ was either Joseph or the Holy Ghost — which? A single word will better answer the question than forty. Christ is able to show us the way to the Father, according to Orthodoxy, because he has been with the Father since the morning of eternity; because he is the only personal manifestation of the Deity; and because he is the second person in the Holy Trinity, co-equal, co-eternal, and co-divine with the Father; or he is able to show us the way to the Father on no higher grounds (the position of some mediators) than Starr King's guide-book shows us the way to the White Mountains. Which position does Mr. Clarke occupy — the former or the latter? If the former,

we clasp his hand, and welcome him to our communion ; if the latter, then the words in the garden force themselves from our lips, however much we seek to suppress them : "Judas, betrayest thou the Son of Man with a kiss?"

We are willing at this point to make additional concessions to those already granted. It is claimed for Mr. Clarke that he is an advocate of

FUTURE AND ETERNAL PUNISHMENT.

In explanation of the 25th of Matthew, he says, —

"The simple, direct, and natural meaning of this passage is, that besides temporal joy and suffering, there are eternal joy and suffering ; besides the joy and suffering which have their root in time and in temporal things, there are joy and suffering which have their root in eternity and in eternal things."

But on another page Mr. Clarke makes use of the following language : —

"The doctrine of everlasting punishment being essentially a heathen and not a Christian doctrine, cannot do any Christian good to any one."

Let no one mistake this for an instance of circumnavigation. It is simply a case

of expert dodging. Another sentence from the same pen will both remove our perplexity, and place the writer in a position which is clearly at issue with all the friends of Orthodoxy.

"*Eternal* and *everlasting*," says the Doctor, "are two wholly different ideas. We fully believe in *eternal* punishment, but not in *everlasting* punishment; because it is eternal, therefore it is not everlasting."

Is there here any difficulty in drawing a line between Orthodoxy on the one hand, and Mr. Clarke on the other? "Eternal punishment," according to Orthodoxy, involves the idea of endless duration; but, according to Mr. Clarke, the idea of limitation of duration. Orthodoxy includes quantity; Mr. Clarke, quality only. But why delay? this pretended friend of Orthodoxy in substance plainly declares, that "any possible amount of sin committed in this world" cannot justify the orthodox view of endless punishment. Can such a man be safely quoted in support of what we term "True Christianity"? The province of this essay does not require us to enter into a defence of orthodox doctrines; but a question may be

asked, Will Mr. Clarke inform us how he knows that no "possible amount of sin committed in this world" would justify the fulfilment of the orthodox idea of future punishment? Will he prove to us that the alternatives are not one hell and one heaven, or two hells and no heaven? And will the body of these rationalistic opponents show us our error when we assert that "gloomy Orthodoxy" is far less gloomy than their own system? They provide no pardon at all for sin, whilst Orthodoxy provides, on the most reasonable conditions, a full and complete pardon for sins of the darkest hue, and an escape for all penitent sinners since Adam, from both "endless" and "eternal" punishment? How merciful the mercy of the unmerciful!

The chapter of Mr. Clarke on

THE TRINITY

presents the same amount of *pro*-ing and *con*-ing as we find elsewhere. It would be exceedingly difficult for one who has not read the Doctor on other subjects to question him here. His statements seem plausible, and his objections forcible. But his New Testament

Trinity, when examined from his point of view, and with his notions of the "Son" and "Spirit of God," is no Trinity for the believer. Mr. Clarke has furnished us, in his criticism on Mansel's "Limits of Religious Thought," a weapon, well-wrought and carefully polished, which cuts so admirably when applied to himself, that we cannot resist the temptation of employing it.

"The first thing which strikes us in the argument is, that everywhere it deals with words rather than with things. The whole object of the discussion concerns the meaning of terms; and it deals throughout with the relation of words to other words. It is an acute philological argument. We feel ourselves to be arguing about forms, and not substances. Now, such arguments may confuse, but they cannot convince. We do not know, perhaps, what to say in reply; but we remain unsatisfied. One not used to logic may listen to an argument which shall conclusively prove that white is black; that nothing is greater than something; that a man who jumps from the top of the house can never reach the ground; but though the thing is proved he is not convinced. So, when Mr. Mansel proves to us that we cannot conceive of a Being who is at the same time infinite and personal, we are unable, perhaps, to reply to the argument; but we know it to be false, since we actually have the two conceptions in our mind. We *do* conceive of the Deity as an infinite personality. Of what use to tell us that we cannot have an idea, when we know that we *do* have it?"

Exactly thus : and of what use is it to fix up a Trinity of words, and present it to evangelical people, with the assertion that we cannot have any other idea, "when we know that we *do* have it?"

The first article of our religious faith is this : —

"There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body or parts, of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness ; the Maker and Preserver of all things, visible and invisible ; and, in unity with this Godhead, there are three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity — the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." *

Of this we have as clear idea as of any view of the Deity ever penned by Mediatorial or Rationalist.

We refer briefly to Mr. Clarke's statements respecting

THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST.

This we have not included among the essential doctrines of Orthodoxy, but it so well illustrates the characteristic method of the reverend Doctor, that we cannot forbear the introduction of his concluding paragraph.

* Methodist Discipline.

“Orthodoxy is right in expecting the coming of Christ in this world; but wrong in supposing it wholly future, and wholly outward. It is right in making it a *personal* coming, and not merely the coming of his truth apart from him; but wrong in conceiving of this personal coming as material to the sense instead of spiritual to the soul. It is right in expecting a judgment, but wrong in placing it only in the other world. It is right in supposing that all mankind — the converted, the unconverted, and the heathen — are to be judged by Christian truth; but wrong in supposing that this judgment must occur in one place, or at one time.”

Whatever the appearances may be, there is not here a single essential concession to Orthodoxy. The statements are all in the interest of the opposition.

Why does Mr. Clarke say that Orthodoxy, in expecting the coming of Christ, is wrong in supposing it “*wholly*” future and “*wholly*” outward? Orthodoxy has always believed that Christ, as represented by the Holy Spirit, is continually coming to the earth. What else do Mediatorials mean? But what right has Mr. Clarke to say that Orthodoxy is wrong, in its faith that the *personal* coming of Christ will not be “wholly future and wholly outward?”

Again: What right has Mr. Clarke to as-

sume that Orthodoxy is wrong "in conceiving of this personal coming as material to the senses, instead of spiritual to the soul"? * Or what right has he to affirm that Orthodoxy is wrong in placing the judgment "only in the other world"? † Or what right has he to publish to the world that Orthodoxy is wrong "in supposing that *the judgment* must occur in one place, or at one time?" ‡ Are we not justified in saying that all these presumptuous assertions are made in the interest of infidelity, and are false?

Lastly, our religious system, considered generically, presents points at issue with the school we are reviewing.

The entire mediatorial family allows of nothing exceptional. Anything "eruptional" (to employ their own term) in God's dealings or providence is simply ridiculous. There are no warts or moles, no miracles (as we have seen), no earthquakes.

Mr. Clarke differs from the other wing of the Mediatorials only in this. He admits the exceptions and eruptions, but claims they

* Compare Rev. i. 7.

† " Heb. ix. 27.

‡ " Rev. xx. 11, 12, 13.

are natural and orderly ; that, in fact, the natural is supernatural, and the supernatural is natural. Exceptions are not exceptions, but the rule ; and eruptions are not eruptions, but smooth surfaces. This is old-fashioned Tympanum philosophy and theology. Both wings of the school consequently object to our system of religious effort. Some of them charge upon us motives which indicate that orthodox people are worse in character than they in their charity ever charged upon the worst of their opponents.

Mr. Clarke is far less gross in his representations, though he complains that religion, to employ his own language, is made by us

“ To consist in a struggle, an agony ; not a regular work, not a steady growth. Everything about it is uncertain and tentative. . . . Out of this way of thought comes the revival system, which is a curious blending of machinery and expectation, of adroit and careful management, with reliance on some great inspiration. Crisis and development are to be expected, no doubt ; but we do not set a trap to catch the Spring.”

Beautiful, but not applicable ; the one is natural, the other supernatural. The spring comes in natural order, and by observation ; the kingdom of heaven does not.*

* Compare Luke xvii. 20.

"Such a system," continues the doctor, "dis-jointed. at its centre, must necessarily work badly." But it works admirably with us. The crescent turns her increasing quarter upon our church full as much as upon his. "To carry on the work of the church by revivals," he still continues, "is as unreasonable as it would be to carry on a school or a cotton factory by a revival system." Upon which, is it not true that a revival in the market has an astonishing effect? He adds:

"The Church of Rome has a great advantage over Protestant Orthodoxy in this respect. It, too, admits revivals, and has its periods of extraordinary attention to religion. But there is this great difference: it does not depend on them for creating Christianity in the soul; it uses them only for increasing its warmth and power."

Now, we honestly confess our repugnance to a system in which Protestantism and Romanism, Orthodoxy and Radicalism, Spiritualism and Anti-spiritualism, Something and Nothing, an Angel and the Devil, are pronounced good, better, best, simply as a matter of policy or convenience. The man * who recently said in an orthodox body that he could believe in their God if they could not in his, did not pay them such a wonderful

* Mr. Clarke.

compliment, for he would say precisely the same thing to a Spiritualist, Chinaman, Hottentot, or Feejee Islander, if seated with him in a convention, or at a cannibalistic table. "*My friends*" is henceforth proverbial. Too much of the "good Lord and good devil" confuses, then disgusts us. There is a radical difference between Orthodoxy and the school of Mr. Clarke, — a difference that precludes the possibility of harmony. Paint is well, but it changes not the substance of things. Subsoils are not immediately fertilized because of a fall of autumn leaves upon the surface soil. Some things, from their nature, cannot be assimilated. The lion and tiger may be *trained* to live together; light and darkness dispel each other.

Mr. Clarke may employ all the hinge-makers in Christendom, for indefinite ages, he can never make Unitarianism or Radicalism one with Orthodoxy. Hinge-making, religiously and philosophically considered, is a profitless occupation. Better make the issue at once, and offer the challenge; otherwise what Mackay says of Neander's "*Leben Jesu*" will be far less applicable to that work than to the entire system of Mr. Clarke.

“ He never boldly confronts his antagonist ; on the contrary, he gives up half the issue ; thus trying to steer midway between two opinions with a show of impartiality and magnanimity, assisted by reckless inexactitude of criticism, and leaving the ultimate decision to mere sentimental feeling.”

Dr. Schwartz rounds out the same observation thus :—

“ I confess that this kind of sentimental criticism, which looks no difficulty manfully in the face, and, consoling itself with trivial expedients, exhibits a comfortable self-complacency in the midst of the most palpable contradictions, is utterly incompetent to meet the pungent and coherent suggestions of modern scepticism.”

Indeed, it seems to us that there never was a greater misapprehension than this under which Mr. Clarke is laboring, when he supposes that the orthodox people are so feebly established that a little of this ambiguous coaxing and cooing will move them from their foundations. They have both substance and evidence in their faith : will they accept a shadow ? What want they of empty husks, when they have been nourished with ripened ears ? Orthodox Christian people are upon a rock ; they know it ; they feel that others are in the sea. They

are confident others are in doubt. Go into their social meetings in times of revival, and at *other* times also, and be convinced. Better still, visit their homes in times of bereavement and distress. Has not Mr. Clarke read of the thousands upon thousands who have lived and died in this substantial faith of the gospel? will he practically ignore this mass of historic evidence? All the waters of the deluge, pouring through the nether gates, cannot affect those eternal foundations of truth : will they be overcome by these feeble rills that flow for a day?

But as we continue the investigations, our charges against Mr. Clarke grow no less kindly, but still, more serious ; for, when sharply questioned, he does not deny that he is as much opposed to current Orthodoxy as is Samuel Johnson or John Weiss. In a bit of controversial correspondence with Mr. Johnson, he makes use of the following characteristic language : —*

“ The Unitarians have, for fifty years, been opposing the infallibility of the letter, that is, opposing the verbal inspiration of the Bible. This, as we are now told by Mr. Johnson, is still his

* Radical for May, 1866.

object; only, he thinks they ought to go further, and deny the infallibility of Jesus himself. But if you cannot convince Christians that the printed letter of the word must be fallible, how can you convince them that the word in the mind of Jesus was so? If they will not see a contradiction between Matthew and Mark, which is before their eyes, how will they be persuaded of that of which no mortal can ever see or know anything, — the mystery of the experience hidden in the soul of Jesus? The real evil which Mr. Johnson, with all the rest of us, wishes to oppose, is the idolatry of the letter of the Bible. I maintain that you can only do this by showing that in doing it you are not opposing the legitimate authority which belongs to any of these. . . . If you wish, then, to abolish radically the superstition which worships an outward infallibility, you can only do it by giving men something better in its place. ‘The human soul,’ say the Buddhists, ‘is like a leech; it will not let go its hold by the tail, till it has fastened elsewhere by the head.’ A false authority cannot be conquered by opposing all authority, but by substituting a better. A Radical ought to go to the root of the matter; and you never reach the root of human errors by a merely negative treatment. You must find out the truth in the error in order to convince the errorist. When you attack his extreme with the opposite extreme, you may silence him, but you do not convince him.”

Will Mr. Clarke allow us to paraphrase this language? We will endeavor to do him no injustice. “Mr. Johnson, I believe as

you do. We are one respecting our real estimate of these things. I, with you, am working to overthrow current Orthodoxy. The only difference between us is one of words. You are too outspoken in your views [for which we commend him]; cover up your real designs as I do, and you will succeed better. Let us ambush the enemy by screening ourselves for a little time under orthodox phraseology. Consent to be a decoy duck. Invite into your pulpit, as I do into mine, this harmless phantom of supernaturalism. Fix up your philosophy so that it will look religious. Then, when our orthodox friends are well befogged, we will suddenly leave them in the lurch, escape from these cloudy exhalations to our own summits of rationalistic supernaturalism. The alternatives remaining will be starvation in the swamps, or an unconditional surrender to us." Then will dawn, we suppose, Mr. Clarke's millenium, or "era of good feeling." Then the lion, tiger, and donkey, with natures unchanged, will lie down together in the embrace of this Mediatorial Fraternity. Good Lord, deliver us!

If we have rightly interpreted Mr. Clarke,

we respect Mr. Johnson much more of the two. It is far more honest to proclaim at once the contrariety between evangelical and radical supernaturalism, — side with error boldly, and combat Orthodoxy resolutely, — than to affect an impossible concealment of differences by means of sophistical evasions, unnatural phraseology, and adroit dissimulations.

It is from the occasional use of such expressions as those contained in the above letter, that we are ever inclined to ask Mr. Clarke, when reading his smooth sayings respecting Orthodoxy, "Sir, will you have the kindness to allow us to look for a moment under your cloak, for we suspect there is another arrow concealed to be employed against us if you fail of your mark with the one now on the string?" With these facts before us, we are constrained to say, that if we accept these flags of truce proffered us, and if we allow Mr. Clarke to plant his ensigns upon our ramparts, as he has done upon those of Unitarianism, as he is seeking to do upon those of Romanism, Spiritualism, Judaism, and every other ism, the world will look upon us as traitors to the cause for

which we have pretended to bleed, and God will most certainly raise up, from the stones of the street, children who will serve and defend his truth. This leads us to the third question proposed.

III.

Are Orthodox Christians called upon, at the present time especially, to make immediate issue with the Mediatorial School of New England?

We may here find differences of opinion. Members of this fraternity have contributed towards the building of our churches, towards the support of our preachers, and do so still. They own pews in our places of worship, and agree with us upon certain points of doctrine. The Methodist church has received less persecution from this body, as a whole, than from almost any other sect or denomination. Hence it is asked, Why now provoke a different state of things, by opposing Mediatorials, even if it be in defence of our own peculiar doctrines? Let us be understood. It is not a question of personal abuse of which we are speaking. It is

not a question of a cordial clasp of hands as neighbors, or of warm greetings in the market-place as fellow-citizens. Had we the pleasure of a personal acquaintance with Mr. Clarke, we are sure, from what we know of the man, that it would be cordial and lasting.

We, as Christians, are expected, at all times and in all places, to deport ourselves as becomes Christian gentlemen. The point with us is, whether or not we will defend the interests of a client. We may receive personal abuse in silence, but that silence must be broken the instant a righteous cause is in danger. David, king of Israel, has scarcely an equal in his forbearance towards personal enemies, and scarcely an equal in his resentment against those who oppose the King of Heaven. Social comfort, family relations, and financial relief, are not, in these religious issues, to be entertained for a moment. "For I am come," says Christ, "to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and a man's foes shall be they of his own household." * This kind of religious encounter, however great, al-

* Matt. x. 35.

lows also of uninterrupted social harmony. The main question before us is reducible to this: If we ought not to listen to words of congratulation from those who are opposing us without honestly disclosing to them our convictions; if we ought not to receive funds for the building of churches and the support of preachers, under false pretences, from those who laugh at our Puritanical notions and mock our revival movements, by not so much as letting them know that we feel hurt by such attacks, or that we intend to use the funds entirely in the interests of Orthodox Christianity (with this understanding we will gladly receive all they will contribute), then manifestly we ought at once to join issue with our opponents. A delay is dishonest and dishonorable to us. They cannot respect us unless we are truthful and plain in our statements. Nay, they will rightly despise us if we break not the silence; and unless we do it, we are disloyal to ourselves and the Master we serve. Or, if it is right to oppose those who present Infidelity under the language of Evangelical Christianity, if it is right for us to oppose a curious mingling of Deism and Naturalism, — a species

of Pantheism mixed with seeming Orthodoxy, — a system than which none in a more lovely and bright appearance ever promised more or will give less ; which can afford neither rest nor shelter, though it promises to provide both ; — if it is right for us to protect ourselves against this something between mist and small rain, which always indicates an approaching tempest, then it is right and binding upon us to oppose the advances of this dangerous infidelity with that degree of foresight and earnestness which the exigencies of the times demand.

Or, again, if it is right for us to join issue with those who are advancing with hostile intent upon territories heretofore conceded to us, — if it is right for us to join issue with those who are seeking to draw to themselves the African Methodist church, the wandering Israelite, and the Catholic of shaken faith, to instruct them each to war against Orthodoxy, — if it is right for us to join issue with those who oppose and ridicule us when, by revival movements, we seek to lead these men of impenitent hearts towards Christ, — then it is manifestly right for us to join immediate issue with this school we have re-

viewed ; — for such are the steps they are taking, and such the opposition we receive.

A man who will not stand up and stand out for his faith under such provocations, is not a man, he is only a half-grown and half-fledged boy.

The position occupied at this point will likewise settle the question of ministerial exchanges with all anti-evangelical denominations. This matter of exchange is not a question of courtesy or of social intercourse. Personal friendship is not interdicted. But the moment these men enter our pulpits we surrender to them our side-arms, which is unsoldierly. If they are honest and earnest men, they cannot help taking advantage of any such proffered position, either by advocating directly their peculiar views, which would be comparatively harmless, or else by advocating formally our own peculiar views, which would be exceedingly dangerous. A lump of sugar may contain poison sufficient, if introduced into the system, to affect a man's physical health for years, and for life. This is what we fear, and this is sufficient to call upon all philanthropic Christians to

occupy that position which will not unnecessarily expose to danger those who might receive the poison. Nor is it a question of whether or not these men are really Christian men. We are liberal enough to believe that not a few outside the evangelical church are Christ's followers, and will triumphantly enter heaven; while not a few in the evangelical church will be cast out. The heart may be right (the more important personally) and the head wrong; but the case in question is this, — if these men are Christians, it is in spite of their theories. The majority of the race could not be Christians if governed by anti-evangelical theories. We object to receiving these men into our pulpits, not from our objections to the *men*, but to their *views*, which have a tendency to dwarf and destroy. A man *may* entertain a given opinion with impunity to himself, which, if expressed, will be destructive to others. The Christian-hearted Channing is virtually the father of the Rationalistic Unitarianism of New England. Except for the overruling providence of God, all anti-evangelical theories will leave a black and damaged page in human history.

We are aware it is claimed that there are anti-evangelical men who are gentlemanly and courteous, charitable and devout, and that it is a shame for us to exclude them from our free communion. Dr. A. P. Peabody and Dr. A. A. Miner are said to be almost or quite evangelical, — may we not encourage them by occasional exchanges? *

We repeat, that it is not a question of personal qualities or attainments which is to render for us a decision as to pulpit exchanges, — these men may be eminently our superiors in some respects, — but it is a question of fundamental principles. Rebels are often gentlemanly and courteous, charitable

* That was a suggestive remark made by a member of the convention, while reviewing the positions of this essay: "I am a graduate of Cambridge. I hold the leaders of the Unitarian body in the highest regard. I have been hoping all along that they would come over on to Orthodox ground; but I must confess, after having looked for thirty years to see some signs of this in the various publications from that body, that I have not yet been able to discover the first word indicating such a tendency." This is a long probation. Will a single proposed exchange with a Unitarian divine secure the consummation! Nay, thirty years longer will not discover that which has been looked for. Nothing short of conversion to evangelical truth will accomplish it. Then we will all seek an exchange with these men.

and devout, practically and theoretically Christian. Who has a more gentlemanly address than Robert E. Lee? Who is more affable in his deportment than Jefferson Davis; who more devout and sincere than Stonewall Jackson? But what do these fine qualities avail when the principles of Liberty and Union are at stake? Would you ask Federal officers to exchange with these polite gentlemen on the ground of personal qualities and unexceptional deportment? Exchange! Yes, we did ask them to exchange, — urged them to exchange, — paid them to exchange, — (better more exchanges), — not in pulpits, — but with shots! Orthodoxy is attacked daily by the conservative as well as by the radical wing of Unitarianism and Universalism. It is attacked by the press, by the pulpit, and social circle; attacked in argument, satire, and ridicule. Have we no objections to make? The American Unitarian Association, which represents the (so called) evangelical wing of the denomination, has issued publications which reduce Christ to the level of the ordinary and the purely human. The doctrine of his supernatural conception is affirmed to have

"grown up as a legend," and to have "attached itself to the fragmentary biographies of him in Matthew and Luke." "I lack words to express," says one of these conservative Unitarians, "my sense of the incoherency, irrationality, and general shockingness of the common (i. e., the orthodox) view of the atonement."

We regret exceedingly that we feel obliged to say anything against a man so distinguished and beloved as the Rev. Dr. Peabody. Few Unitarians have a wider circle of friends among Trinitarians, and no man, for affability and Christian deportment, is more deserving of universal respect. But the interests of evangelical truth require us to speak, even though every personal consideration invites to silence.

One of the most dangerous tracts now in circulation is from the pen of Dr. Peabody, under the title, "Was Jesus of Nazareth Identical with the Almighty Creator?" The doctor plays mad havoc with the New Testament in an attempt to support his various positions, which are bald and stark infidelity. The truth is, that the entire anti-evangelical community is permeated with this

Mediatorial philosophy, or something no better. The Unitarians, as a body, conservative and radical, if we mistake not the action of the late National Unitarian Convention, are marching to-day under the banner presented to it by James Freeman Clarke. Must we not, therefore, if we decide to draw the line of denominational exchange anywhere, draw it so that it shall divide evangelical from anti-evangelical belief?

We now pass to the fourth and last inquiry.

IV.

With what Spirit on our Part ought the Controversy to be conducted.

I. *The spirit should be gentlemanly and Christian.* There should be nothing on our part like cold reserve. Personal animosity must not enter our hearts for a moment, or we are unfitted to engage in a religious controversy. From any public movement we should not stand aloof because of the presence of our opponents; still respecting our own special mission as advocates of orthodox Christianity, we should remain as im-

movable as the granite mountains, and as truthful and outspoken as the Son of God. We should not, in the presence of our adversaries, say, "Yea, yea!" when we mean "Nay!" That is supremely contemptible. But with faith in our cause, with frank courtesy in our speech, "with malice towards none, and a personal charity towards all," we should deem it the province of a Christian gentleman to oppose, with all our energies, an aggressive infidelity.

2. *With a spirit of perfect composure.* The doctrines we advocate are positive truths. They are destined for universal influence. When the battle thickens, therefore, we are to have faith, nothing doubting. We should never allow fear, lest the foundations of our religion shall be destroyed, to disturb us in the least, or excite within us the first indications of a fever of alarm. The composure of the Deity should be ours. The figure, "He that sitteth in the heavens," reveals to us the relation of True and False Christianity. Mr. Clarke may call us fools, and say that we cannot perceive a manifest contradiction between Matthew and Mark. What of this? We know that "all the hos-

tile weapons which have been used against us have been shivered like straws, — the broken fragments lie glistening upon the unharmed bosom of evangelical Christianity.”

The history of the past tends to inspire in us nothing but the profoundest confidence. Our opponents are answered by our opponents. The sciences under cultivation of infidel hands lay all their trophies at our feet. They are our allies. They strike deep; they reach far. The coarse assaults of Paine and Voltaire were long ago silenced by the research and eloquence of *non*-believers. It is surprising how little of this work comparatively has been accomplished by Orthodoxy in its tardiness. Materialism is conquered by Naturalism; Atheism by Deism. Truth is vindicated by her enemies. Strauss is opposed by Dorner. The Tübingen School received some of its death blows at the hands of Ewald. Hase assailed common Rationalism in the interest of philosophical Rationalism. Idealism pales before Realism. Atheism has found its ablest opponents in theoretical Deism. Pantheism is fought heroically by Parker and Johnson. Parker and Johnson, in their more objectionable

modes, are met quite militarily by more conservative men. And many the sly but agonizing thrusts does the old school Unitarian and Universalist receive from the entire body of the Mediatorials. Nay, the ranks of this school to a man often advance on to orthodox ground, make an about face, and discharge a round, full volley at Cambridge and Antioch. Thus, we repeat, we have nothing to fear concerning the truths of Orthodoxy. Babes, under this wonderful providence of God, can defend them. The mighty tides and waves of the ocean are stayed by banks of *sand*. Soon from the dying embers of Mediatorialism will arise another school, which shall stand for a time upon the ashes of the fallen, disclose some beauty in Christianity, and then pass away. Thus the battle has gone, and thus will it continue to go. The battle-field has often been strewn with wrecks, but Christ has passed over and gathered up all the spoils. We must therefore enter upon this controversy with that kind of magnanimous generosity which is inspired in the breast of one who is absolutely certain of victory.

3. *We are to be none the less earnest and*

active, vigilant and self-sacrificing, because of our confidence and certainty. No man is allowed to be indolent in the Master's service. It is because of too much indolence on the part of true children that God has at times raised up from the stones of the street those who have unwittingly praised him. Our activity hastens the coming of Christ. The languages of the Old and New Testament Scriptures are not dead languages. Every word is pregnant with an inspiring vitality. "Go, work in my vineyard," means not sleep and refreshments; it means *work*. It means to *prune* and *weed*, as well as to dig and dress. A valiant soldier is an active soldier, and such are we required to be.

We shall often be tempted during the controversy to leave the well-beaten track walked by the fathers, and revealed by Jehovah. Leave it not. It is the habit of those * who have gone over from evangelical to rationalistic philosophy to exult in their new freedom, bound henceforth by no "creeds" or "formula." Poor men! we pity them. Do they expect to make new discov-

* For illustration, Robert Collier.

eries in the theological world? There has not been a new discovery in theology for eighteen hundred years, nor will there be for eighteen hundred years to come, by any school of philosophy, or sect of religion. The days of revealing these truths are past, and the book is closed until the end of time. Do they expect to discover a more substantial basis than that upon which the fathers stood — the orthodox supernatural? It nowhere exists. Bound to this, we are not slaves, but the freest men that walk the earth. The ship on the sea without rudder, without compass, without chart, with no hand at the helm, is free; but that ship is freer which has chart, compass, rudder, ballast, whose keel easily ploughs the sea, goes round the world, and comes safely home again. The locomotive that climbs the rail, and plunges with its screeching train down an embankment, is free; but that one is freer which clings to the rail, speeds on its way like a bird in its flight, until it reaches in safety its destination. Being off the track is not real freedom! If God has marked out a course for men to follow, safety and success depend upon following it. In this sublimer

than Appian Way, evangelical Christianity is marching to the conquest of the world.

The weapons we are to employ in this controversy are simple and spiritual — the weapons of the fathers. God commends their use. His blessing is especially upon them. Our opponents will tempt us to throw them down. They know their power. "Am I a dog, that thou comest to me with staves?" will be heard throughout the encampment. But cling to the simple weapons. They are the flying artillery of the field, the most easily handled, and the most effective in execution. It is the simple publication of Christian experience as the work of the Holy Ghost; it is earnest, practical piety, linked with old-fashioned revival efforts, that will shake the foundations of false Christianity more terribly than all the heavy artillery ever forged in our schools, or dragged upon the fields of religious controversy.

Oliver Optic's Magazine

For 1869.

GREAT INDUCEMENTS TO SUBSCRIBE.

OLIVER OPTIC,

Who writes for no other Juvenile Publication,

WHOSE BOOKS HAVE AN ANNUAL SALE OF

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND COPIES,

Is now engaged in writing a series of Stories expressly for this Magazine, entitled,

The Lake Shore Series.

In No. 105 (Jan. 3, 1869) will be commenced

LIGHTNING EXPRESS; or, The Rival Academies.

To be followed by

ON TIME; or, The Captain of the Ucayga Steamer.

WITCH OFF; or, The War of the Students.

BREAK UP; or, The Young Peacemakers.

Making four Stories by Oliver Optic, to be published in "Our Boys and Girls" for 1869, the cost of which when completed, would be \$5.00,—double the price of the Magazine.

In addition to Oliver Optic's contributions, Wide Awake Stories by popular authors, Original Articles, with American Ideas, by American Authors, Sketches of Travel, Hunting, and Fishing, Original Dialogues, Declamations, Puzzles, Rebuses, &c., Illustrations by the best Artists, make

Oliver Optic's Magazine, Published Once a Week

The best as well as the cheapest Juvenile Magazine published in the United States. Being the publishers of over

TWO HUNDRED JUVENILE BOOKS

By the most popular American Writers, the proprietors of Oliver Optic's Magazine believe they have superior facilities for making this Magazine

A Welcome Guest at Every Fireside,

Where its high moral tone commends it to parents.

Terms, \$2.50 per year. \$1.25 for six mos. 6 cts. per No.

Specimens furnished free on application to the publishers by mail.

LEE & SHEPARD, Publishers,

149 Washington Street, Boston.

CHRISTIAN GIFT BOOKS.

Printed on tinted paper; bound in rich morocco cloth.

1.

WORDS OF HOPE.

By the author of "Golden Truths." 4to. Price \$2.00.

This is a judicious selection of many of the best thoughts of the most eloquent and eminent writers, treating subjects which are in themselves "words of hope" to the suffering and sorrowing. The subjects treated are,

God Chasteneth in Love.

Children in Heaven.

Trust in God.

Death.

The Sympathizing Friend.

The Eternal Home.

The Fruit of Sorrow.

2.

GOLDEN TRUTHS.

By the author of "Words of Hope." 4to. Price \$2.00.

"This is a precious volume, aptly illustrating the motto of the title page, 'A word fitly spoken is like apples of gold in pictures of silver.' The aim of the compiler has been to gather from the words of the great and good such extracts as would strengthen, cheer, teach, comfort, and bless devout, earnest souls, and aid them in attaining the rest in 'the heavenly home' at last. The result is a volume of a very high order, full of vital, eloquent truth."—*Christian Advocate, N.Y.*

3.

LIFE'S MORNING;

Or, Counsel and Encouragement for Youthful Christians.

By the author of "Life's Evening," "Life's Quiet Hours," &c.
4to. Price \$1.50.

4.

LIFE'S EVENING;

Or, Thoughts for the Aged. By the author of "Life's Morning," "Life's Quiet Hours," &c. 4to. Price \$1.50.

5.

LIFE'S QUIET HOURS:

Being Quiet Hints for Young and Old. By the author of "Life's Morning," "Life's Evening," &c. 4to. Price \$1.50.

"Life's Morning," "Life's Evening," and "Life's Quiet Hours" are eminently fitted for use as devotional guides in the family. Written in a vein of deep religious fervor, by a writer of culture and experience, no more fitting or beautiful works can be placed in the hands of the young, the middle-aged, and the old, to teach the glory and beauty of Christian life. Under the name of

THE CROSS AND CROWN SERIES,

They are put up in handsome boxes, and can be obtained in sets or separate.

Sold by all Booksellers and New-dealers, and sent by mail, post-paid, on receipt of price.

LEE & SHEPARD, Publishers, Boston.